

Questions	Answers
<p>1. Section L.18, subsection (a), states that Prime Offerors shall furnish the information for all of our most recent contracts (completed and ongoing) for similar efforts with a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred of \$2.5M that our company has had within the last 5 years of the RFP release date. Attachment Draft Exhibit 16 Past Performance Questionnaire Instructions, paragraph 4, states that only performance in the past 3 years with a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred of \$5M is relevant. Please clarify whether past performance references should meet the \$2.5M/5 year requirement as stated in Section L.18 or whether the \$5M/3 years requirement stated in Attachment Draft Exhibit 16.</p>	<p>The past performance references shall meet the requirements of the Final RFP stated in section L.18. Prime Offerors shall furnish the information requested below for all of your most recent contracts (completed and ongoing) for similar efforts with a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred of \$5M that your company has had within the last 5 years of the RFP release date. Indicate which contracts are most related (i.e. similar in size and content) and how they are related to the proposed effort, as well as which contracts were performed by the division of your company (if applicable) that will perform the proposed contract/subcontract.</p> <p>Exhibit 16 Past Performance Questionnaire Instructions will be updated to reflect the criteria listed in section L.18. of the Final RFP</p>
<p>2. Please confirm that, subject to the criteria stated in Section L.18, subsection (a), there is no limit to the number of past performance references to be provided.</p>	<p>As stated in L.14 Proposal Preparation – General Instructions (JAN 21020) (b) Proposal Content and Page Limitations, there are no page limitations for Past Performance Questionnaires or Customer Evaluations.</p>
<p>3. The following was stated in the answer to Question #14 in the last Question and Answer release: "No response to the objectives or the functional requirements in the SOW beyond what appears below is required, nor is a response expected." The use of this phrase at a general level has resulted in the following question: Is it NASA's intention to have the bidders respond to the management of the entire SOW in the management plan or just the management approach and staffing for the 3 RTOs and 5 scenarios? For example should our approach for staffing requested within the management plan only be concerned with staffing of the RTOs?</p>	<p>Offeror's response to SUBFACTOR B, MANAGEMENT PLAN, shall cover the entire Statement of Work.</p> <p>As stated in L.16 (3) Mission Suitability Instructions by Subfactor - <u>SUBFACTOR A – UNDERSTANDING THE TECHNICAL APPROACH, THE SCENARIOS, AND REPRESENTATIVE TASK ORDERS,</u> "The full SOW will be incorporated into the contract in order to define the scope of the contract. For the purpose of demonstrating a thorough understanding of the work required within the scope of the SOW, Offerors shall address the following enhancements, efficiencies, or</p>

	innovations, scenarios and Representative Task Orders (RTO) only. No response to the objectives or the functional requirements in the SOW beyond what appears below is required, nor is a response expected.”
4. DRL is referenced as SOW section 11 in L.18 and M.5 but in the SOW it shows up as Section 12. We are looking for clarification on the referenced SOW in sections L 18.3 and 4 and M5.3, M5.5, M5.6, and M5.7	The SOW reference was for Section 11, DRL requirements. These requirements were called out separately for the past performance. This separation has been removed for the purposes of providing past performance. This will be reflected in the final RFP.
5. L.17.2.e states that Basis of Estimates (BOEs) are for the Representative Task Orders (RTO) only, that each RTO cost proposal shall include a separate BOE section, and that BOEs shall be submitted by both the Prime Offeror and all significant subcontractors. In Section L.14.b.1 it states that the page limitation for Cost Volume Basis of Estimates is 20 pages. Does each of the three RTO BOEs receive a 20 page limitation, i.e. RTO 1 BOE – 20 pages, RTO 2 BOE – 20 pages, RTO 3 BOE – 20 for a total of 60 pages)? Or is it a 20 page limitation for all three RTO BOE sections combined?	The page limitation for all three RTO BOE sections will be a total of 30 pages. This will be stated in the Final RFP.
6. The following links posted to the NASA Procurement Library Home do not work: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. NCCS Fiscal Year 2012 User Services Improvement Project b. Mods.(21-34).NNG09HP07D.(Final.Redaction).PDF c. Mods.(11-20).NNG09HP07D.(Final.Redaction).PDF d. Mods.(01-10).NNG09HP07D.(Final.Redaction).PDF Request that the identified links be corrected/reposted.	The identified links have been corrected.
7. Will the government be providing representative performance standards for each of the RTOs to enable evaluation of the adequacy and	This response is to provide an updated answer to this question, which was previously posted in Question Set #4

<p>reasonableness of the Offeror's RTO solution?</p>	<p>which was posted to NAIS on April 16, 2012. The updated answer is as follows:</p> <p>By representative performance standards, the Government is assuming this to mean service level agreements. No, the Government will not be providing specific service level targets for any of the RTOs. Offerors <u>may</u> propose appropriate service level agreements for the RTOs. The final RFP (Sections L and M) will be modified appropriately.</p>
--	---